

bills or wants a lot of bills, but this is the system. You know, clearly it says here that that bill belongs in Transportation. Now we are either going to abide by the rules or the whole system goes to pot, as far as I am concerned. I realize there is a lobby group out there that wants this bill go to Judiciary. It does not belong in Judiciary, clearly does not belong in Judiciary. Jack Rodgers put it in Transportation and then it was changed by the Reference Committee. So it clearly belongs in Transportation, and I just urge you to rerefer that bill to Transportation.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Chizek, please.

SENATOR CHIZEK: Well, obviously, I disagree with Senator Lamb, and I think the realities are simple to grasp. The public has demanded that government act on the problems of drug abuse, and they rightly...and rightfully so, in my opinion. And I think these problems are multifaceted, multidefinitional, if you will, and in short, there is an overlap, and not pieces that have any connection with each other. The public is not failing to see that alcohol abuse is a part of the fabric of the problem. Response is being made to that which the public sees and demands a response to. One response is Senator Langford's LB 846 addressing suspension of driver's license for drug related offenses. Another response, colleagues, is Senator Abboud's LB 927. Other responses are Senator Pirsch's LB 976 and LB 977. Another response is Senator Lynch's LB 1062. Finally, there is LB 1114. Whether each and every sentence of these bills represents the best that we can do is a question for review in the next few weeks, colleagues. Today I think it is important that we see they share a common element of that being a response, that they share one common element in approach, specifically, cementing these suggestions with criminal penalties. All, including LB 1114, were assigned to the Judiciary Committee. At first blush, LB 1114 might, in fact, not seem to belong in this group, but its proposal to lower the level at which a person is considered legally intoxicated is, in effect, a proposal that goes to the abuse of a drug constituting a crime against society. It may even be considered, and I stress, not by its words by themselves but by their effect, to be a newly defined crime, again, one piece of the main is at were, which is the final reason why the bill should remain in Judiciary. As we respond, we need to see what the public sees. The view and the review of the issue must not be piecemeal. We must ask ourselves the logic of expected responsible hearings